



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,060	12/21/2001	Kimberly Ann Newell	M233.101.101	2940
25281	7590	11/03/2005	EXAMINER	
DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, P.L.L.C. FIFTH STREET TOWERS 100 SOUTH FIFTH STREET, SUITE 2250 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			LUU, SY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/028,060	NEWELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sy D. Luu	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Response filed August 17, 2005.
2. Claims 1-83 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 49, 62, 75, 80 and 81 are independent claims. This action is made Non-Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grow (US 6,694,315 B1) in view of Bedell et al. (US 6,622,128 B1).

As per claim 1, Grow teaches a computer-based user interface for accessing litigation information associated with at least one litigation case, the user interface comprising: a website for managing litigation information, wherein the website provides querying and updating docket information (col. 2, lines 4-35). Grow does not explicitly disclose the details of the website to comprise of a home page including a first plurality of user-selectable hyperlinks, each hyperlink in the first plurality of hyperlinks identifying a category of litigation information, and a plurality of web pages, each web page associated with one of the hyperlinks in the first plurality of hyperlinks, each web page providing litigation information related to the category identified by the hyperlink associated with the web page, each web page displayed in response to selection of the hyperlink associated with the web page. However, besides all website accesses being inherently involved with a homepage upon entering, other detail setups and access organization

of information for a website as claimed are also known in the art. For instance, Bedell teaches an internet based litigation management method, wherein a homepage is provided as well as the home page including a first plurality of user-selectable hyperlinks, each hyperlink in the first plurality of hyperlinks identifying a category of litigation information, and a plurality of web pages, each web page associated with one of the hyperlinks in the first plurality of hyperlinks, each web page providing litigation information related to the category identified by the hyperlink associated with the web page, each web page displayed in response to selection of the hyperlink associated with the web page (figs. 12 and 3; col. 19, lines 4-34). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include these features with Grow's teaching in order to provide a user with means for quickly navigating through web pages to arrive at the desired litigation information for browsing, and/or for updating.

As per claims 2-34, 36 and 43, Grow teaches/suggests categories to be various types of information such as contact information, docket information, correspondence information (col. 5, lines 4-14); pleadings information, discovery information, trial information (col. 12, lines 20); motion information (col. 6, line 21), rules (col. 9, lines 63-65), expert (col. 9, lines 5-6), court orders (col. 12, line 27), client (col. 17, line 21); search feature (col. 3, lines 14-15) and obtaining/downloading electronic copies (col. 6, lines 56-58) . Grow does not expressly disclose patent, copy, and status information, as well as detail description of all the information, and the downloading of electronic copies being done via hyperlinks. However, these types of information and features are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine/include these information/features with the teaching of Grow in order to provide all pertinent information as required in a litigation management system.

As per claims 35, 38-42, 44-48, all claim limitations such as various configuration of client/server computers and data storage methods on a networks, presenting to users all main menu options/hyperlinks at all times, and launching application programs from a web page using hyperlinks are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine/include these features with the teaching of Grow in order to facilitate users' navigation of web pages, as well as to manage, share and distribute litigation information efficiently and effectively.

Claim 49 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 17 and 40, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 50-51 are similar in scope to the combination of claims 7, 14, 21, 27, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 52-53 are similar in scope to the combination of claims 2-3, 5, 7, 10, 14, 18, 21, 24, 27-28, and 11 are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 54-58 are similar in scope to claims 33-36 and 38 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 59-61 are similar in scope to claims 46-48 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 62 is similar in scope to claim 49, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 63-66 are similar in scope to claims 52, 56-58, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 68-69 are similar in scope to claims 42 and 44, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale. Although Grow does not expressly indicate data storage to be

Art Unit: 2174

on the client computer, however, the choice of storing data information in either the server or client in a network environment is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to select either storage destination as a preference depending on the implementation method.

Claims 70-74 are similar in scope to claims 62, 65, 50-52, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 75 is similar in scope to claims 49, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale. Bedell further discloses a client login page (fig. 11).

As per claim 76, Grow does not expressly disclose the user interface information to further comprise: a plurality of topics pages, each topics page associated with a particular client and including a plurality of hyperlinks identifying a plurality of topics; the plurality of hyperlinks identifying a plurality of topics including a litigation hyperlink; and wherein each litigation case selection page is associated with a litigation hyperlink on one of the plurality of topics pages. However, all of these detail setups and access organization of information for a website are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include these features with Grow's teaching in order to provide a user with means for efficiently navigating through web pages to arrive at the desired litigation information for browsing.

As per claims 77-79, all claim limitations regarding the use of inactive hyperlinks, links to client's competitors as well as client's intellectual property applications are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include these features with the teaching of Grow in order to facilitate users navigation of web pages, as well as to provide users with means to quickly access pertinent and critical litigation information.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 81 is similar in scope to claims 50 and 52, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 82-83 are similar in scope to claim 65, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to all independent claims 1, 49, 62, 75, 80 and 81 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the limitations that were not disclosed by Grow are not well-known facts, and requests the Examiner to cite a reference in support of such teachings. Accordingly, the Bedell reference is provided, as set forth in the rejection section above, in support of the Examiner's assertion that the limitations that are not disclosed by Grow are indeed either common or well known to an artisan at the time of the invention.

Conclusions

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2174

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sy Luu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:300 am to 4:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SY D. LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2174